

they were written and enacted, then American voters have no control over the laws that govern them. We will be ruled in that kind of scenario by a self-anointed class of five philosopher Kings in black robes.

I fear Judge Jackson may see the Court in that very way. I fear that based on her answer to a question in the hearing raised by one of my colleagues. In response to that question, she said:

Well, anytime the Supreme Court have five votes . . . they have a majority for whatever opinion they determine.

The Constitution demands more, and the American people deserve better.

For all these reasons, I oppose Judge Jackson's nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The Senator from Delaware.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, we are in the middle of a horrible global pandemic. Later this month, we will pass a tragic milestone of a million Americans killed by COVID-19. Already, more than 6 million globally have died.

And I know we are all sick and tired of it, completely tired of it, done with it. I hear all the time at home and here that we are done with this pandemic, but, unfortunately, it is not done with us.

This week, this body has failed to take minimally responsible action. And I am going to speak for a few minutes to what it means that we have failed to come together to pass another urgently needed appropriations bill both to meet our domestic needs for therapeutics and vaccines and for treatment and for the development of the next vaccine for the next variant and what it means that we have delivered zero additional resources for global public health to address this worst global pandemic in a century.

The bill that we should be taking up now and is being blocked by disagreements would have provided \$10 billion to help provide additional protection for 330 million Americans, to buy the therapeutics that we need, to invest in the research to make sure that we are ready for the next variant, to finish providing the public health support for vaccinations.

While we may think we are done with the virus, 30,000 Americans yesterday tested positive. It has touched all of our communities, our families, my own family, our own neighborhoods. We are not done with this.

Senator SCHUMER and others of my colleagues have been saying on this floor and in public and in private relentlessly, we must deliver more resources. Well, I am here to say that we cannot get this pandemic under control here in the United States and secure the safety and health of our people until we have delivered meaningful vaccine protection around the world.

It is shortsighted for us to say that because we are done with it, it is done with us. I will remind you, we have twice before gone through periods

where things were looking better, things were looking up, and then the Delta variant emerged, the Omicron variant emerged in other places in the world where vaccination rates were not what we might hope for, not what we have achieved here and in other countries.

So let me briefly explain why this is a case of "pay me now or pay me later." I understand the fiscal concerns that have driven some to say we should spend no more, but I think we will discover the foolishness of a view that says we need not spend more.

First, it is just a waste of money, folks. We have already bought hundreds of millions of vaccine doses that are now not going to be delivered in countries in the world, and particularly in Africa, where the public health systems are not developed enough to actually translate vaccine doses into vaccinations.

As I learned during the Ebola epidemic in Liberia, that last mile from the capital to the regions to villages is really hard to navigate. It is hard to navigate here in the United States, heck. But in countries without cold storage chains, without rural public health resources, without the resources to pay for people to go and vaccinate, not having that last dollar to go that last mile means that we are letting people die when we have got the vaccines to save their lives; and it means we continue to have 2.8 billion unvaccinated people around the world.

Second, this is a moment where we can teach the world, again, that the United States, long the most reliable global public health partner, can be counted on in this critical moment. Dozens of countries could not get our vaccines 6 months or a year ago, so they have relied on Chinese and Russian vaccines that are ineffective against Omicron. A variant emerged able to get around Sinopharm and Sputnik, the vaccines delivered by the Chinese and Russians.

So we have a moment when dozens of countries around the world are asking for our help. We have got the vaccines; we have got the opportunity; and we are failing to take advantage of this moment.

The most compelling reason, of course, is our own people's health. We have seen this cycle before, and we will see this cycle again.

How bad is the vaccination status in other places around the world? Well, briefly: Yemen, a country undergoing a horrific war with widespread famine, their vaccination rate is less than 1.5 percent. In Haiti, in our hemisphere, a nation of 11 million people, their vaccination rate is below 1 percent. The number of folks fully vaccinated in two great countries on the continent of Africa—Tanzania, 60 million people; Nigeria, 200 million people—below 5 percent.

We cannot afford to allow this virus, COVID-19, which is like a safecracker, out there in the world to just keep

twisting the dials and testing, testing, testing—because every time it infects someone, it has a chance to mutate. Every time it mutates, it has a chance to get past our defenses.

We will regret this failure. We need to treat this like the global health emergency it is, and we need to realize that we already had hundreds of millions of people facing food insecurity before the Russian invasion of Ukraine accelerated the vulnerability of millions of people around the world because Ukraine is the breadbasket from which is fed countries all over the region: the Middle East and North Africa, from Syria to Somalia. We are going to see food riots, increased instability, and millions more in hunger.

So, folks, I will keep at this. I will keep working. I will keep mobilizing and engaging my colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, in making the case until it is done; but we have a moral imperative, an economic imperative, a political imperative, a humanitarian imperative to save our own country and our own people by providing the resources the world needs and deserves.

We have so many good partners in this—organizations like One, USGOC, Care, Catholic Relief Services, Save the Children, Bread for the World, and many others—too many to name. But we need the same level of energy and commitment and engagement in this Chamber that we have heard from calls from around our country and our world. The world is looking to the United States to use the vaccines we have, use the resources we have, provide the support to get us on the other side of this pandemic globally. Mr. President, this is the moment that we should do it.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. President, I want to speak briefly to a great accomplishment that will occur in this Senate later this week: the confirmation to the U.S. Supreme Court of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have lived through—I have endured—several confirmation processes. I will say, this is one that brings me some joy, a sense of lift that we are making history for this Chamber and for the Supreme Court.

Justice Breyer, who has announced his intention to retire, is someone who has spent decades on the Federal bench, on the Supreme Court, and has lived up to the highest ideals of American jurisprudence; and I am confident Judge Jackson, as Justice Jackson, will continue in that tradition. She has, as we learned in our week of confirmation hearings, a deep understanding of the Constitution, a great sense of the balance and the role of a judge, limited to understanding the Constitution, law, and facts passed in front of her and with a limited role to decide the questions presented based on the law and the facts.

We also got to hear about her family, her history, her experiences, her service, her impeccable legal credentials,

her service on the Sentencing Commission, her work as a trial and appellate court judge, her experience as a clerk at all levels of the Federal judiciary, and her time as a Federal public defender.

She is a devoted daughter, sister, wife, mother, friend, and someone who is humble enough to say that she knows and loves the Constitution from which our freedoms flow. She stands on the shoulders of those who went before her—her parents, both proud HBCU graduates and the first in her family to go to college. Her uncles and her brother served in law enforcement, in the military. She is so well grounded in those institutions and traditions that have made our Nation great; and it fills me with confidence to know that a person of this skill, of this background, of this sense of judicial temperament—who endured a grilling that was, at times, tantamount to harassment by other members of the Senate Judiciary Committee—demonstrated her grace, her courage, and her integrity under sustained fire.

I very much look forward to the votes we will take in this Chamber later this week, and I will be honored to vote to confirm Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to be the next Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise again, with my increasingly battered poster, to call on this body and in particular on corporate America to wake up to the threat of climate change.

Just this week, the IPCC report came out saying that we are now at the do-or-die, last-chance moment. The other interesting thing about that IPCC report was that it, for the first time, focused on the role of malicious fossil fuel political influence in preventing the solution.

Political influence is actually contributing to the climate change problem, and it is the scientists who are now pointing this out.

Well, one of the worst expositors of that political influence, the monster in the middle of that political influence campaign here in the United States, is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. And I want to talk about them in a minute; but, first, let's do just a quick recap because we have known about climate change for a long time.

Scientists knew about the greenhouse effect back when Abraham Lincoln was riding around Washington in his top hat. In the 1950s—in the 1950s—the oil industry began research on the effects of greenhouse gas pollution. In 1977, nearly a half century ago, Exxon's top scientist warned management of what he called “general scientific agreement”—half a century ago, mind you—“general scientific agreement that the most likely manner in which mankind is influencing the global cli-

mate is through carbon dioxide release from the burning of fossil fuels.”

A Republican-led committee led by my predecessor, John Chafee, held a Senate hearing on climate change in 1986; and in 1989, the Chamber of Commerce—one of the most influential forces in Washington and now one of the biggest lobbyists for fossil fuel interests—the U.S. Chamber of Commerce issued a report for business leaders about the threat of climate change.

We have dug out that report because they entered it into the RECORD in a House proceeding later that day, and here is what that report said. I will quote at some length.

[T]here is qualitative agreement among prognosticators that sea levels will rise . . . wetlands will flood, salt water will infuse fresh water supplies, and there will be changes in the distribution of tree and crop species and agricultural productivity.

A significant rise in sea levels will flood now inhabitable land in some countries. . . . These same actions will affect wetlands and it may not be possible [to] protect both coastal and wetland areas.

Georgia, very susceptible to this, as the Presiding Officer knows.

Flooding will intrude into water supplies, such as in coastal cities (e.g., Miami and New Orleans). . . . Changes in temperature patterns will affect natural ecosystems by altering the distributions of species, and affecting forestry and silviculture. . . . [C]rop lands will change. . . . The stress will depend on changes in precipitation patterns.

Global warming will affect snowfall patterns, hence melt, and affect water supplies. Most of California's water supplies are from snow melt and if snow is reduced to rain, or melts quickly during the winter, water supplies in the summer will be less than now.

Does any of that sound familiar? Of course. It is what we are looking at around us now, and it is what the U.S. Chamber of Commerce predicted in 1989.

Knowing that, what did the chamber do? I will tell you what the chamber did.

Over the past two decades, every time Congress took up good climate bills, the chamber conspired to kill them.

The reason is pretty simple: The chamber serves as the arm of the fossil fuel industry. It takes its money, and it does its dirty work.

A couple of years ago, a witness at our Special Committee on the Climate Crisis explained how big trade groups like the chamber “adopt the lowest common denominator positions on climate of their most oppositional members.”

Fossil fuel pays the chamber to kill anything that threatens what the IMF estimates is an over \$600 billion annual subsidy for fossil fuel in the United States. On climate, it is not the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; it is the “U.S. Chamber of Carbon.”

Here are some of the corpses in the chamber's legislative graveyard. In 2005, the chamber opposed bipartisan cap-and-trade legislation. It issued a “key vote alert,” a signal that whoever voted in favor of the bill could face an onslaught of political attack ads.

Down the legislation went.

The chamber used the same playbook to kill cap-and-trade bills in 2007, including the aptly named Wake up to Climate Change bill that had started to gain steam until the “Chamber of Carbon” dug in against it.

In 2009, the chamber led the charge against the most promising climate bill in decades: the Waxman-Markey bill. The chamber spared no effort killing it. It harangued members, issued more vote alerts, and published “How They Voted” scorecards, with a clear message: Cross us and we will come after you.

Since then, the chamber's axis of influence in Congress has refused to hold hearings on, mark up, debate, or vote on any serious climate legislation.

At the same time, the chamber fought climate action in the courts and in executive Agencies. Here are a few of their cadavers there: In 2010, the chamber sued EPA to overturn the finding that greenhouse gas emissions endanger public health and welfare. Disabling that “endangerment finding” would cripple the Agency's ability to regulate carbon pollution under the Clean Air Act.

When courts rejected the chamber lawsuit, the chamber then set up as central command for fossil fuel lawyers, coal lobbyists, and Republican political strategists, who devised the legal schemes to fight climate regulations. This produced another chamber lawsuit to block the Clean Power Plan to reduce carbon pollution from powerplants. And on this occasion, five Republican appointees on the Supreme Court killed the Clean Power Plan using the shadow docket. They didn't even have proper hearings on it.

Once President Trump took office, the chamber began attacking and undoing Obama administration rules limiting carbon pollution. The chamber even funded the phony and debunked report that the Trump administration relied on to justify leaving the Paris accord.

The chamber's climate obstruction has continued across all fronts under President Biden. It released a position paper championing “clean” coal, which is right up there next to dry water and chilly heat. And, of course, it led the charge against our reconciliation bill, attacking more than \$500 billion in climate-related investments.

To make all this dirty work possible, the chamber weaponized the dark money powers afforded by the Supreme Court's ruling in *Citizens United*. The chamber knew the power that this decision would grant them. Indeed, it filed an amicus brief in that case, telling the Court to knock out limits on so-called outside spending.

And *Citizens United* then allowed outside groups to spend unlimited sums on electioneering activities, which teed up the chamber to funnel roughly \$150 million into congressional raises. And they bought a lot of climate denial with that money. It made them the